

It is believed that these modifications meet the examiner's objections to these claims and places claims 11, 25, 30, and 32 into condition for allowance.

In respect to the examiner's substantive 35 USC 102(e) rejections of claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-10, 12-14, 18, 20-21, 23-24, 26-27, and 33 as being anticipated by Muramoto U.S. Patent 6,405,837, applicant has amended independent claims 1, 18, and 33 to include a recitation that the piston is moveable "substantially perpendicular" to the rotational axis of the shaft. It is believed that this differentiates over any construction of the Muramoto reference wherein the stator plate 136, that the examiner cites as a mechanical activator, is moved in a direction co-extensive with the rotational axis of the shaft 138 (see col 3 lns 23-34).

In respect to the examiner's 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claims 1-10, 12, 15-16, 18-24, 26, and 34 as being anticipated by Larson U.S. Patent 2,339,415, applicant has modified independent claims 1, 18, and 34 to recite that the cavity is on the same side of the rotational axis of the mechanical actuator. It is believed this recitation additionally distinguishes over the Larson reference wherein there is a semi-circular brake lever extending over the drive shaft (see fig 3; pg 2 col 2 lns 8-12, 73-75; pg 3 col 1 ln 7).

The claimed construction significantly simplifies the brake as claimed in the present application.

In respect to the examiner's 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claims 1-10, 12, 15-24, 26, 28-29, 31, and 33-34 as being anticipated Cox U.S. Patent 2,328,619, applicant has modified the present independent claims 1, 18, 28, and 33 to recite that the cavity is displaced from the friction surface of the brake in respect to the longitudinal length of the rotational axis of the shaft. This is to be contrasted with Cox wherein the base member 3 is positioned directly beneath the drum (see fig 2; col 1 lns 36-41).

In respect to claim 34, applicant has amended this claim to clarify its brake actuator. It is mounted as an integral unit separately from the brake including its friction surface. It is believed that this differentiates over the Cox reference wherein it appears that everything but the brake drum 1 is mounted as an integral unit.

In respect to the examiner's indication of allowance of claims 25 and 30 if rewritten into independent form, applicant has rewritten these claims into their indicated condition for allowance.

It is believed that the above remarks places the

application into condition for allowance.

Favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

William S. Lightbody  
William S. Lightbody